


REMARKS

This amendment is responsive to the Office Action mailed March 10, 2004. In that Office Action the Examiner allowed claims 1-20 and 22-48, which the undersigned gratefully acknowledges. Claims 49-51 were rejected under 35 USC § 102(b) as being anticipated by the Hughes Flying Boat.

Merely in the interest of expediting prosecution, the limitations of Claim 52 have been introduced into independent Claim 49, and dependent Claim 52 cancelled without prejudice.

It is believed that this places the application in form for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Mark D. Elchuk

Reg. No. 33,686

Attorney for Applicants

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, MI 48303
(248) 641-1600

Date: April 29, 2004
MDE/cmn